

## REMARKS

This Response is filed in reply to the Office Action dated July 18, 2003, which is an Election/Restriction. The issues of the July 18, 2003 Office Action are presented below with reference to the Office Action.

With regard to the Office Action, paragraph 1: Examiner provides two (2) inventions as follows:

Group I, claims 1, 2 and 21-25; and

Group II, claims 3-20 and 26-30.

In Response, Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, Group I, claims 1, 2 and 21-25, and provisionally withdraw claims 3-20 and 26-30. It is respectfully submitted that examination of all claims simultaneously would place no undue burden on the Examiner, as examination of the claims of Groups II necessarily entail a search of the subject matter of Group I. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the examination of Groups I and II together present no significant burden over the examination of Group I alone, as all groups include features that include gas injection moulding.

As Examiner knows, for a restriction requirement to be valid, the Examiner must establish that the search and examination of the entire application cannot be made without serious burden (see MPEP §803). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request examination of all claims simultaneously.

The Examiner contends that the "apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different method, one wherein the gas is injected into the melt as the melt is being injected into the cavity." Claim 1 recites a method including the step of flowing the injection gas between the gas inlet and outlet apertures in use. Claim 21 recites a method comprising, among other things, injecting a melt into a mould and injecting gas into the melt to form a gas cavity in the melt. Neither claim 1 nor claim 21 includes limitations having a gas injection step separate from a melt injection step. Thus, Applicants submit that the methods of claim 1 and claim 21 include injecting gas into the melt as the melt is being injected into the cavity.


With regard to the Office Action, paragraphs 2-6: Applicants provisionally elect Group I, with traverse, as provided herein, and acknowledge Examiner's comments regarding inventorship.

### Conclusion

Applicants consider the Response herein to be fully responsive to the referenced Office Action. Based on the above Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance is requested. If there are any remaining issues or the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with Applicants' attorney would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 617-832-1175.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 11, 2003

  
Robert W. Gauthier  
Reg. No. 35,153

Foley Hoag LLP  
World Trade Center West  
155 Seaport Boulevard  
Boston, MA 02210

Phone: 617-832-1175  
Fax: 617-832-7000